REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 29, 2004 has been received and carefully studied.

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a), requiring the electromagnet recited in claim 5 to be shown or the feature cancelled from the claim. Submitted herewith are corrected drawing sheets showing the electromagnet in Figures 4A and 13. It is believed that the amended drawings overcome the objection.

Applicants hereby affirm their election to prosecute the invention of species 1, claims 1 and 11-14. In addition, by the accompanying amendment, claim 6-10 have been cancelled.

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Goldman al., U.S. Patent No. 4,192,482. The Examiner states that Goldman discloses a method of moving a valve comprising providing a valve 12 with a drive shaft 15, providing valve seat 18, 19, causing the valve to seal with the seat by forcing the valve toward the seat, thus putting the valve in a first stationary position, reducing the force in an amount sufficient to break the seal, thus also moving the valve to a second unsealed stationary position, and while the valve is in the second unsealed stationary position,

restoring the effect of the force to subsequently re-seal the valve.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires the step of restoring the effect of the force to cause the valve to seal against the valve seat when the valve is in the second stationary position. Thus, the operation of the instant method involves causing the valve to seal against the valve seat when the valve is in a first stationary position by forcing the valve towards the seat, reducing the effect of the force to break the seal, moving the valve to a second stationary position, and restoring the effect of the force to seal the valve in the second stationary position. Accordingly, the valve is sealed in position A, the seal is broken, the valve is moved, and is then sealed in position B.

In contrast, the Goldman valve is always sealed at the same stationary position; i.e., the position shown in Figure 2. The movement of the valve is from the open to closed position; it is not between two different sealed positions as in the instant invention as claimed.

The allowability of claims 11-14 is noted with appreciation.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin S. Lemack
Reg. No. 32,579
176 E. Main Street - Suite 8
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581
TEL: (508) 898-1818